FIKS'S NOTICE OF HEARING FOR MOTION

TO DISMISS

KRONENBERGER BURGOYNE, 150 Post Street, Suite 520 San Francisco, CA 94108 www.KronenbergerLaw.com

CASE NO. 3:08-cv-02474-BZ

4

6

11

16

150 Post Street, Suite 520 San Francisco, CA 94108 www.KronenbergerLaw.com

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on May 21, 2008, Defendant Mikhail Fiks ("Fiks"), noticed a hearing for July 11, 2008 before the Honorable Samuel Conti for a Motion to Dismiss (the "Motion") (D.E. No. 5) Plaintiffs Limo Hosting, Inc. and Oleg Gridnev's (collectively, "Plaintiffs") Complaint pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). On July 8, 2008, the Court took the noticed hearing off-calendar, stating that it intended to decide the Motion without oral argument or appearance. Subsequently, and before the Court issued its ruling on the Motion, this matter was reassigned to the Honorable Bernard Zimmerman on August 15, 2008.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that Fiks accordingly re-notices its Motion for October 1, 2008, or as soon thereafter as the Motion may be heard by the Honorable Bernard Zimmerman in Courtroom G on the 15th floor of United States District Court for the Northern District of California, San Francisco Division, located at 450 Golden Gate Ave., San Francisco, CA 94102.

This Motion seeks to dismiss the Complaint because: 1) Plaintiffs have not pleaded secondary meaning of the LIMO HOSTING mark or Fiks's use thereof as required for statutory and common law trademark infringement; 2) Plaintiffs have not pleaded that their website contains protectable trade dress, and that their website is nonfunctional; 3) Plaintiffs' claim for False Designation or Origin is not based on any recognized cause of action and duplicates Plaintiffs' other causes of action; 4) Plaintiffs' Complaint does not contain allegations that Fiks made statements disparaging the quality of Plaintiffs' property as required to support a claim for trade libel; 5) Plaintiffs' Complaint does not contain sufficient allegations about the relationship between Plaintiffs and third parties to support interference claims; and 6) Plaintiffs' Section 17200 claim is purely derivative of its other claims, and therefore cannot stand.

This Motion is based on Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 12(b)(6), Fiks's Memorandum of Points and Authorities filed on May 21, 2008 (D.E. No. 5), Fiks's Reply

1

KRONENBERGER BURGOYNE, 150 Post Street, Suite 520 San Francisco, CA 94108 www.KronenbergerLaw.com

CASE NO. 3:08-cv-02474-BZ